

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/022,757	12/14/2001	Scott W. Corzine	10010430-1	2523	
75	90 12/06/2004		EXAM	INER	
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.			PRITCHETT,	PRITCHETT, JOSHUA L	
Legal Department, DL429 Intellectual Property Administration			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
P.O. Box 7599			2872	2872	
Loveland, CO	Loveland, CO 80537-0599		DATE MAILED: 12/06/2004	\$	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/022,757	CORZINE ET AL.			
navioury notion	Examiner 571-272-2318	Art Unit			
,	Joshua L Pritchett	2872			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 12 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no					
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S	See MPEP		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 					
The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:				
(a) I they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.	· /				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NO	OT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: 26					
Claim(s) objected to: 20,22 and 24.					
Claim(s) rejected: 12-19,21,23 and 25.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	· _			
10. Other:		Record Tour	\sim		
	SUPER	DREWA. DUNN /ISORY PATENT E)	KAMINER		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 10/022,757

Ŋ

Application No.

Continuation of 5. The applicant aruges in the Amendment filed November 12, 2004 that the Stankus reference fails to teach the claimed support wall. The applicant cites col. 8 lines 5-10 in Stankus which states, "the sidewall spacer 70 is any material that can be etched selectively to the layers 62-68 and the substrate 12." The examiner notes that the sidewall spacer of Stankus "can be" etched, Stankus does not state that the sidewall spacer "must be" etched. Therefore the sidewall spacer of Stankus may reamain as part of the structure and the claim limitations read on the Stankus reference. The applicant further argues that the Stankus reference does not teach or suggest the use of a GaAs-air Bragg reflector. The applicant argues that the layers 62-68 of Stankus are made of a material and that "a material" does not include the likes of a gas, liquid or vacuum. The examiner considers air to be a material because it consists of matter, which is the definition of material (Webster's Collegiate Dictionary Tenth Edition). Stankus states that, "the layers 62-68 may comprise any material... that provides proper Bragg reflection properties." The examiner supplements the teachings of Stankus with that of Ho that states that GaAs-air is a known combination of materials used to create a Bragg reflector.